



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

- Brummer, S. D.** *New York State during the Period of the Civil War.* Pp. 451. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911.
- Porter, George H.** *Ohio Politics during the Civil War Period.* Pp. 255. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911.

The authors of these two volumes are to be congratulated on their contributions to the new but important and difficult field of state history during the Civil War. With two lines of development, state and national, in our history, going on at the same time, each influencing the other and each in turn influenced by the other, it is difficult for the student to devote himself to the one and at the same time correctly interpret the other; the difficulty is particularly liable to arise from 1861-1865, when probably the most powerful influences in state politics came from the nation at large. But this difficulty the authors solve in general in a commendable fashion. In every case, to be sure, the reader will not accept Dr. Brummer's and Dr. Porter's judgment as to the emphasis to be laid on the national field; for example, many will look in vain for a fuller treatment by both authors of the military situation in 1862 and 1864, and the sway in this way exercised on the states. In the latter year the victories and defeats on the field of battle most dramatically governed the ups and downs of state affairs, and so did the presidential campaign of the same year; yet both these movements seem to receive insufficient recognition. The authors here are sticking too closely to their subject.

While the volumes deal mainly with political conventions, platforms, leaders and speeches, some readers would demand a fuller treatment of popular conditions. In this connection, the subject of arbitrary arrests and imprisonment readily lends itself to picturesque treatment of individual cases, such as may be found in the pages of the *New York World*.

The positive contributions of the authors hinge, first upon the development of party politics in New York and in Ohio, the states of Seymour and Vallandigham. The growth of the Weed-Seward and Greeley factions among the republicans in New York, the causes of this rivalry, and its influence on national affairs, are related by Dr. Brummer in great detail and with great interest. Probably no one has so well described the political issues of the New York campaign of 1862, which resulted in the election of the democratic candidate, Seymour, as Governor, and the same interest attaches to the description of the progress of the Seymour administration. Factional quarrels in Ohio were not as important as in New York, but the peace democracy under the Ohio leader, Vallandigham, affords Dr. Porter abundant opportunity for intensive study, and this task he very creditably performs.

The second important contribution of both authors is the same, emphasis on the work of the so-called union party. Says Dr. Porter: "The republican party, which had been formed in 1854, was never revived in Ohio after its demise in 1861. The issues on which it had been formed were settled by the war. The new party, formed in 1861, outlived the war, and continued its existence with new issues. The present republican party is not, therefore,

a successor of the organization of 1854, but rather of the union party of the war period." Dr. Brummer believes in the disappearance in New York of the same original republican party. The conclusion seems to be too strong. As a party trick, to win votes at a time when republican votes were very essential, the name of the republican party was indeed changed, but never the principles. The republicans did not believe that they joined a new organization; they merely sought recruits by a ruse. It was certainly good republican policy in 1861 to oppose compromise on the question of territorial slavery, and later to insist on the positive prohibition of slavery there, and as a great anti-slavery organization the party naturally advanced into other anti-slavery policies as the war advanced. It must be remembered, too, that the number of voters in the union party, who were not republicans, was small, that the normal democratic strength of 1860 fell off but little, that that of the republicans, as seen in the union vote, increased but little, and that the formal union organization was very different in different states. It is best to look upon the union organization not as a new party, but only as a temporary manifestation of the republican party during a short period and under peculiar circumstances. This criticism of their conclusions must not, however, be allowed to detract from the authors' success in investigation and orderly presentation of difficult material.

EMERSON D. FITE

Yale University.

Chadwick, F. E. *The Relations of the United States and Spain; The Spanish War.* Two vols. Pp. xx, 926. Price, \$7.00. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

Military training, participation in the war and exceptional access to material make Mr. Chadwick's account of the Spanish War unusually valuable. A large part of this "documentary history," as the author calls it, is formed of well chosen selections from the sources. His personal opinions are kept in the background except perhaps in the discussion of the Sampson-Schley controversy, in which Mr. Chadwick believes great wrong was done to Sampson, one of the noblest of public servants.

The most interesting feature of this work is the extensive presentation of the Spanish point of view in the war, until now a field neglected by American writers. No evidence could show more conclusively the reason why the American victories were won so easily than the quotations from the despatches exchanged between the Spanish ministry and Cervera. Unpreparedness, inefficiency of administration and inadequacy of fighting material are shown to have existed in the Spanish navy to a degree greater even than in our own War Department. On the other hand, the performance of the United States navy comes in for praise which the evidence submitted seems to show is justified. Under the circumstances, which the despatches of the Spanish admiral show were known but persistently disregarded by the Spanish ministry, the outcome could not have been other than a foregone conclusion. When a country is willing to order to sea vessels which it